

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are amended.

New claims 6-7 are added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Kemppinen (US Patent 7,076,276 B2) in view of Lustila et al., (U.S. Patent 6,771,938 B2).

Regarding the amended claim 1, neither Kemppinen nor Lustila discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable reflecting units for reflecting plural times the light emitted from the light source and incident on the incident portion and guiding the light to the emitting portion, wherein the reflecting units comprise a first reflecting unit and a second reflecting unit, wherein the first reflecting unit is provided on the front face of the light transmitting member and the second reflecting unit is provided on the back face of the light transmitting member.

Kemppinen does not disclose the above-described reflecting unit, since the mass 100, which corresponds to the reflecting units of the present invention, does not reflect plural times the light emitted from the light source, and does not comprise two units which are the first and second reflecting units. The mass 100 is only provided on the back face of the light emitter 200 or 201 which corresponds to the light transmitting member of the present invention. There is no disclosure in Kemppinen that another reflecting unit is formed on the front face of the light emitter 200 or 201.

The Office Action states that Lustila et al., discloses incident on the incident portion plural times and guiding the light to the emitting portion. However, the amended claim 1 does not claim “incident on the incident portion plural times”, but claims “reflecting plural times the light emitted from the light source and incident on the incident portion.” In fact, Lustila et al., does not disclose the reflecting units of the present invention. The outer protective covers 13-15 disclosed in Lustila et al., are not equivalent to the reflecting units of the present invention, since they do not reflect light, but is only capable of diffusing incident light (Lustila et al., column 3, lines 1-2 and 5-7). “Diffusing light” is different from “reflecting light.” The former means the scattering of incident light through a translucent material, while the latter means the return of light from a surface after hitting the surface. Also, Lustila et al., does not disclose reflecting plural times the light emitted from the light source and incident on the incident portion, and the reflecting units comprise a first reflecting unit and a second reflecting unit, wherein the first reflecting unit is provided on the front face of the light transmitting member and the second reflecting unit is provided on the back face of the light transmitting member.

Thus, the combination of Kemppinen and Lustila et al., does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1, since the combined device would not have the reflecting units of claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of Kemppinen and Lustila et al., does not render claim 1 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 which are dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Kemppinen (US Patent 7,076,276 B2) in view of Lustila et al., (U.S. Patent 6,771,938 B2) and further in view of Hankui (U.S. Patent 6,745,057 B1).

Claims 4-5 are dependent from claim 1. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are included in claims 4-5.

Regarding claim 4-5, none of Kemppinen, Lustila et al., and Hankui discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable the reflecting units for reflecting plural times the light emitted from the light source and incident on the incident portion and guiding the light to the emitting portion, wherein the reflecting units comprise a first reflecting unit and a second reflecting unit, wherein the first reflecting unit is provided on the front face of the light transmitting member and the second reflecting unit is provided on the back face of the light transmitting member. Neither Kemppinen nor Lustila et al., discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable the above-described reflecting units, as discussed above regarding claim 1. Hankui does not disclose that the reflecting plates 1a, 1b and 1c reflect the light plural times and guide the light to the emitting portion. None of the reflecting plates 1a, 1b and 1c of Hankui is provided on either the front face

or the back face of the light transmitting member. In fact, Hankui does not disclose any light transmitting member.

In addition, regarding claim 4, none of Kemppinen, Lustila et al., and Hankui discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the first reflecting member is provided at approximately a center of the light transmitting member, and a V-shaped groove is provided at a surface boundary between the first reflecting member and the light transmitting member. The Office Action states that Hankui discloses a V-shaped groove is provided at a boundary on surfaces. Although Hankui discloses that the reflecting plate is bent to be V-shaped (Hankui; column 3, lines 9-10), there is no disclosure in Hankui that the V-shaped portion is provided at a surface boundary between the reflecting member and the light transmitting member. In fact, as shown in Figure 7 of Hankui, the V-shaped portion is provided at approximately the center of the reflecting member. Also, Hankui does not disclose that any of the reflecting plates 1a, 1b and 1c of Hankui is provided at approximately a center of the light transmitting member, since Hankui does not disclose any light transmitting member.

Thus, the combination of Kemppinen, Lustila et al., and Hankui does not meet all of the limitations of claim 4 or 5, since the combined device would not have the reflecting units of claim 4 or 5. Also, the combination of Kemppinen, Lustila et al., and Hankui does not meet all of the limitations of claim 4, since the combined device would not have the first reflecting member provided at approximately a center of the light transmitting member, and a V-shaped groove provided at a surface boundary between the first reflecting member and the light transmitting member. Therefore, the asserted combination of Kemppinen, Lustila et al., and

Hankui does not render claims 4 and 5 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claims 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Regarding new claim 6, none of Kemppinen, Lustila et al., and Hankui discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the first reflecting member and the second reflecting member repetitively reflect the light emitted from the light source to propagate the light in the light transmitting member and to emit the light from the emitting portion.

Regarding new claim 7, none of Kemppinen, Lustila et al., and Hankui discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that the light transmitting member further includes a V-shaped groove, and the V-shaped groove is provided in the vicinity of a surface boundary between the first reflecting member and the light transmitting member. The V-shaped portion of Hankui is not included in the light transmitting member, but a part of the reflecting plate 1h, as shown in Figure 7 of Hankui. Also, the V-shaped portion of Hankui is not provided in the vicinity of a surface boundary between the first reflecting member and the light transmitting member, but is provided at approximately the center of the reflecting plate 1h, as shown in Figure 7 of Hankui.


In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/567,479
Amdt. Dated: August 1, 2008
Reply to Office action of May 2, 2008

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-39645.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 1, 2008